

Content Analysis of Upstream Policy Documents in Cyberspace

Roya. Seddighi¹, Akbar. Nasrollahi^{2*}, Mastrooreh. Ezzatzadeh³

¹ PhD Student, Department of Media Management, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

² Associate Professor, Department of Media Management, Faculty of Social Sciences, Communication and Media, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

³ Assistant Professor, Department of Media Management, West Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

* Corresponding author email address: akbar.nasrollahi@gmail.com

Received: 2024-09-19

Revised: 2024-11-29

Accepted: 2024-12-08

Published: 2025-01-01

EDITOR:

Cavid Qasimov

Prof, Faculty Of Letters Department Of History, Van Yuzuncu Yil University, Van, Turkiye. Email: cavidqasimov@yyu.edu.tr

REVIEWER 1:

Kaushalya Korlage

Assistant Lecturer in Sociology at University of Colombo, Colombo, Sri Lanka. Email: korlage@iouc.cmb.ac.lk

REVIEWER 2:

Vanessa Indama

Public Administration Department, Basilan State College, Isabela City, Basilan, Philippines. Email: vanesindama@gmail.com

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the methodology section, the explanation of the content analysis method (Krippendorff, 2014) is too brief. Please elaborate on why this method was chosen over other qualitative content analysis methods, such as Mayring's approach.

The methodology mentions that the entire text of each document was considered the unit of analysis. Given the volume of text, explain how coding reliability was maintained, particularly in ensuring coder consistency across long documents.

In the findings section, the sentence "Upstream policy documents function as roadmaps for various sectors" is too generic. Provide specific examples from the analyzed documents illustrating how these roadmaps are constructed and implemented.

Table 1 lists analyzed documents, but the table omits any description of the criteria used for document selection. Include a justification for why these specific documents were chosen and how they represent upstream policies in cyberspace.

Table 2 presents focal points and categories, but some categories, such as "Observing red lines" and "Cyberspace governance," lack detailed descriptions. Please provide definitions or examples for these categories for clarity.

In Table 3, the category "Inspirational in the Islamic world and a key player globally" needs further explanation. Specify the indicators or criteria used to categorize this focal point under this label.

The sentence "One of the key takeaways from this analysis is the emphasis on national cybersecurity, digital sovereignty..." would benefit from specific examples from the analyzed documents to support this claim.

The conclusion suggests future research directions, such as "evaluating the implementation of these upstream policy documents." Expand on how future research could methodologically assess this implementation, possibly suggesting a framework or approach.

The authors mention applying Krippendorff's content analysis stages, but there is no mention of any software used for coding (e.g., NVivo, MAXQDA). If software was used, specify it; if not, explain how manual coding ensured accuracy and efficiency.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the introduction, the sentence "In Iran, comprehensive and complete programs have been developed to advance goals in various fields" is vague. It would be helpful to specify which fields are being referred to, especially those relevant to cyberspace governance.

The introduction states, "This research examines upstream policy documents in response to the question: What are the perspectives of upstream institutions regarding the Supreme Council of Cyberspace?" To enhance clarity, explicitly state why this question is significant in the context of Iran's digital policy.

Table 4 lists "Developing and approving security frameworks and ensuring comprehensive cybersecurity at the national level" as a category. However, the article does not discuss how these frameworks are currently structured or their effectiveness. Include this analysis for completeness.

In the section following Table 5, the explanation of Holsti's reliability coefficient is well-detailed, but the reason for selecting Holsti's method over other reliability metrics (such as Cohen's Kappa) is missing. Justify this choice.

The statement "The Holsti index ranges between 0 and 1" is correct, but the text should clarify why a threshold of 0.8 was considered acceptable in this study and provide references for this benchmark in content analysis research.

In Table 6, the coding results show a slight discrepancy (Coder 1 tested 17 codes, Coder 2 tested 16, and 15 were agreed upon). Explain why the number of codes tested differed between coders and how this was managed in the reliability calculation.

The paragraph beginning "The findings of this study highlight the critical role of upstream policy documents..." in the conclusion section is informative but lacks discussion on how these findings compare with existing literature on cyberspace governance in Iran or other countries. Include a comparative analysis.

Authors revised the manuscript and uploaded the document.

2. Revised

Editor's decision: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.